VINDICIÆ VINDICIARUM,

OR

A further manifestation of M. J. C. his contradictions, instanced in *Vindiciæ Clavium*,

BEING

A Rejoinder to his Reply (to some few of those many Contradictions) in his last Book, called, *The Way of Congregationall Churches Cleared*, Part. 2.

By D. C.

JAMES 1. 8.

A double minded man is unstable in all his waies.

Veritas simplex, error multiplex.

LONDON,

Printed by *A. M.* for *Christopher Meredith* at the Sign of the Crane in *Pauls*-Church-yard, 1651.

VINDICIÆ VINDICIARUM.

CHAPTER I.

SECTION I.

Of the Church to which Christ committed the power of the Keys.

THE Question between us in this first *Section*, was concerning the meaning of those words, *The Kingdom of heaven*, in Mat. 16.19. and consequently, *What Church* it was to which the *Keys* were by Christ committed. For the finding out whereof I proceeded by a distinction, If the *Kingdom of heaven* did there signifie the *Church*; it must either be taken 1. Of the *Invisible* Church of true believers, opposed to Reprobates. 2. The *Catholike visible* Church opposed to Heathens; or (as you in answering the first question *pag.* 2. of Keys) to the World. 3. Or a *particular Congregation*. Give me leave I pray to be now a little more exact in stating the question, by enquiring what is the sense of those words, and the *terms* of the question.

1. What is meant by the *Kingdom of heaven*, whereof the *Keys* are here given to *Peter*. The *Kingdom of heaven* in Scripture usage, signifies, either 1. The Kingdom of glory (as frequently) or 2. The Kingdom of *grace*, as in some places, grace being

1. What is meant by the Kingdom of Heaven.
1. Of glory.
2. Of grace.
3. Of both.

the beginning of or first step into that Kingdom of glory, Or 3. It signifies both the Kingdom of grace and glory. And we are both agreed, that in this text it signifies both: My first words in *Vind. Clav.* grant it, and you affirm it; [“By the “Kingdom of heaven here, is meant, both the Kingdom of “grace, which is the Church, and the Kingdom of glory which “is in the highest heavens.] And you give a very good reason for it; [“For (say you) Christ giving to *Peter* the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, conveyeth therewith not only this pow- “er to binde on earth (that is, in the Church on earth, for he “gave him no power at all to binde in the world; *the Kingdom* “*of Christ is not of this world*) but he gives him also this privi- “ledge, That what he bound on earth should be bound in hea- “ven: And heaven being distinguished from the Church on “earth, must needs be meant of the kingdom of glory.] Let this be remembred against anon.

2. What that Church is to whom the Keys are committed.

2. The *Kingdom of heaven*, signifying the *Church* (and that both in heaven and earth (both triumphant and militant) for what he cals in the 19. verse The *Kingdom of heaven*, he cals in the 18. verse, *his Church.*) We must enquire what *Church*, or what part of his *Church* it is to which the Keys are given: This Question (I confesse) is needlesse, in respect to the Text it self; For it sayes nothing at all of giving the Keys to the Church, but of giving to *Peter* the Keys of the Church, called by the name of the *Kingdom of heaven*, which is worth your observation. For it is your *importunity* rather that hath caused this question, who have *arrogated* the *Keys* out of the hands of *Peter*, to whom Christ in this text gave them, and given them to the *Church*, that is (incongruously) to the *Kingdom of heaven*: but of this more anon: We shall therefore follow you (rather then the Text) and consider, what is meant here by the *Church*: It is taken in the Ecclesiasticall use (for I passe by the civill) in many senses: briefly thus.

Church is taken Ecclesiastically for, 1. The whole Church, either 1. The invisible Catholike Church.

1. For the *whole Church*, called commonly by the name of the *Catholike Church*, and that in a double notion:

1. The *Invisible Catholike Church*, the whole number of the Elect, in heaven and earth, in all places and times: so it is commonly understood, *Eph.* 5. 23, 25, 26, 27, 32. *Col.* 1. 18. *&c.*

2. The

2. The *Catholike visible Church* containing the whole multitude of *professors* of Religion, elect or hypocrites, in this world, as opposed to the Church of the Jews, or to the men of the world: So it is taken *Act.* 5. 11. and 8. 3. at least as *contra-distinguished* to a particular Congregation. 2. The visible Catholike Church.

2. For some *parts* of the Church, to whom is attributed the name of the whole, from their *Assembling* together in different combinations: And then it is taken, 2. For some parts of the Church in combination.

1. For a *particular Congregation*, or particular Saints, assembled together; and this again is by some distinguished into 1. A particular Congregation, and that a Church

1. *Politicall* or *Organicall*, consisting of *Officers* and *Members*, as the *Integrall* parts thereof; and those Congregations being members of the *Catholike visible* Church, as *Integrall* parts thereof. The texts are obvious where it is so taken. 1. Politicall.

2. *Entitive* (as they call it) or *Essentiall*, consisting only of a company of Saints combined by consent, without any *Officers*: So the Reverend M. *Hooker* and others use to speak. But (that I may note it by the way) to me, This *Entitive Church* (so called) seems rather to be a notion, never existing, but in mens fancy, in the Resolution or Analysis of a Church into its materials, or else it is very *improperly* called a Church: To my observation and understanding hitherto, there is not in Scripture such an *Entitive Church* to be found, gathered, and existing without any Officers. That place *Act.* 15. 4. 22. produced by the learned and judicious M. *Hudson*, in his *vind. pag.* 3. where he saies ["Church is taken for the members as distinct from Of- "ficers,] doth not hold out a *Church Entitive*, without any Officers (for that had Officers) but only distinguisheth the *Integrall* parts of that Church, into Officers and members: The sense is no more but this, either it means, The Apostles and Elders, with the rest of the *Church-members*; or (if the Church was then distinguished into divers Congregations) it takes in all the Congregations as the whole Church: for so the words are expressed *vers.* 22. the *Whole Church*: And your self call that which we call the *Catholike visible Church*, by the name of the *Whole Church*; when you say here *pag.* 5. ["The whole Church "(or which is all one, the Catholike Church) may be visible in "her singular members] However it appears not, that then 2. Entitive?

there was any *Entitive* Church, existing without Officers. That other Text, *Act.* 14. 23. seems rather to imply it [" And when " they had ordained them Elders in every Church] as if there had been Churches gathered and existing without any Officers. But the sense of the place may be this, when they had gathered and setled *Churches*, of Elders and members, both at once; So soon as there were *members* enough to make a *Church*, they ordained them *Elders*, and made them a *politicall* Church: If not so, yet the Apostles *Paul* and *Barnabas*, were *Officers* to them, before; *Catholick* Officers to them as yet members only of the *Catholick Church*; and now they being to depart ordained them *Elders* in their stead, and made them particular *politicall* Churches. If those members were not confederate by consent (whereof the Scripture saies nothing) they themselves say, they were not a *Church*, but only Materials of a Church, and so members of the *Catholike Church* only, or of none. I shall say something more to this in another place; I prescribe not to any mans judgement, but submit it to consideration, and proceed.

2. The Officers of the Church.

2. As a *Congregation* is called a Church, as afore; so sometimes the *Officers* not only as distinguished, but as separated into a *Court*, are called the *Church*: Our Saviour alluding to that custome amongst the Jews; and not relating to a *Congregationall* Church not yet known, nor yet in being: And now the question returns upon us, To *what Church* of all these, the keys were committed. Some say one thing, some another: you say, to the *particular Congregation*, which we shall consider, when we have added that,

3. How the Keys are given to the Church, whether 1. *Objectivè*.

2. *Subjectivè*.

3. It is to be considered in this question, when the *Keys* are said to be given to the *Church* (which is never said expresly in Scripture) how they are understood to be given to the *Church*. Whether 1. *Objectivè*, that the Church is the *object* of the exercise of the Keys, that is, they are given for the good and benefit of the Church: Or 2. *Subjectivè*, that the Church is the *Subject* Recipient, to imploy and exercise the Keys: and this, either *immediatly* by her self, in whole, or in part, without Officers: or *mediatly* by her Officers: that is, whether the Church be the next and first subject of the Keys, to convey them, or any part of them to her Officers; Or that she is said to be

the

the *remote ſubject*, as including the Officers, to whom primarily and immediatly Chriſt hath committed the Keys for the good of the Church; as *ſight* is immediatly intruſted with the *eyes*, for the good and benefit of the whole body. And if it ſhould happen that any power of the Keys ſhould appear to be given to the Church as diſtinct from her Officers; whether it belong firſt to the *Catholike viſible Church*, or to a *particular* Congregation. The Queſtion then is clearly this [" Whether " the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven be given *ſubjectivè* to " the Church-Catholike in her Officers, on the particular Con- " gregation without (or with) her Officers.]

And now we ſhall conſider what you *reſolve*, upon this queſtion; Thus you aſſert. [" The Church to which the Lord Je- " ſus committed the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, *Matth.* " 16.25. is *cœtus Fidelium*, commonly called a particular viſible " Church, *&c.* To which I anſwered (not as an *Avenger*, there is not the leaſt colour of that, but as an *Aſſertor*, giving alſo my reaſons) Of all the reſt, this is the moſt *improbable* ſenſe of our Saviours words, if by the *Kingdom of Heaven*, on earth, he meaneth that Church of which he ſpake in *verſ.* 18. But that was either the *Catholike* viſible Church; or rather the *Inviſible myſticall* Church, *&c.* That one, or both of theſe (for by my word *rather*, I do not exclude the other) is meant, and that primarily, is to me ſtill moſt probable; upon theſe reaſons.

1. This being the firſt time, that the Church (*my Church*, the *evangelical* Church is named, it is not probable, that our Saviour, would intend it onely of a *particular* Congregation, but of the *Catholike Church*; for that is primarily Chriſts *Church*, and that is properly built upon the *rock*; and againſt that the gates of hell ſhall never prevail; whereas, (as I ſay afterwards) *particular Churches* may fail, and have failed. There is farre more colour for a *particular Church* to be meant. *Matth.* 18. 17. *Tell the Church:* becauſe *excommunication* is executed in a particular Church firſt, and *conſequently* in the *Catholike Church:* but there is not any *ſhadow* for it in the text in hand. Did Chriſt mean, I will build my *Church*, that is, a *particular Church* onely, upon this rock, and not rather the *Catholike Church*, and the particular ſecondarily, as a *member* thereof? It may be a

queſtion between the *Inviſible*, and *Viſible* Catholike Church, which is meant there, (as after,) but none, till of late, ſo much as made the queſtion, betwixt the *Catholike* and *particular* Church.

2. *Peter*, was an Apoſtle, and had given to him the *Keyes* of the *Catholike Church*, not of any *particular Church*; for he (and ſo his fellow-Apoſtles) were never *Paſtors* of any particular Church: therefore, it ſeems more reaſonable, that the *Catholike Church* is there meant. They had *habitually* the *Keyes* of particular Churches, in the Catholike; as Paſtors have habitually the Keyes of the *Catholike Church*, in a particular: They were *actually* Elders of the whole Church; as *Paſtors* are *actually* Elders of a particular Church.

3. The *Keyes* of the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the *Church*, are given to *Peter*, as diſtinguiſhed from the *Church*, therefore they are not there given to the *Church*. As if a *Lord* ſhould ſay to him whom he conſtitutes his *Steward*, I give to thee the *Keyes* of the Family, to open and ſhut the doors of the Houſe; could the ſervants, or children, or any for them, conclude from this grant, the *Keyes* were given to the Family? was *Peter* the *Church* to whom the *Keyes* of the Church were given? And therefore, as *diſtruſting* this ſenſe of this Scripture, you ſay, (as you had ſaid of the other Apoſtles and Elders) [“The Church “or Congregation of profeſſed believers received that portion al- “ſo of Church-power, which belonged unto them, if not there, (that is, in this text in hand) yet elſewhere.] Not here for certain; whether elſewhere or no, ſhall be tried hereafter. It is not a *reaſonable conſtruction* of this text, to ſay, I give to thee the *Keyes* of the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, of the *Church*: and to mean, I give to the *Church*, the *Keyes* of the Church. I ſaid therefore, (and I think truly,) that of all the reſt this is the moſt *improbable* ſenſe of our Saviours words; that it is a *particular* Church, to which the *Keyes* were given, *Matth.* 26. 19. It muſt then be taken of the *Catholike Church*, either Inviſible, or Viſible, or none.

The Keys pag. 5.

But you are pleaſed to take away the *ſubject* of this queſtion, denying any *Catholike viſible Church*: [“For (ſay you) I do “not read, that the Scripture any where, acknowledges a Catho-

“like

"like visible Church at all.] It is supposed by very Judicious *Divines*, that you may read of it often in Scripture, and in this place for one. It cannot be denied, but the Church, is often put for the whole multitude of beleevers, whether in truth, or in shew only: *Acts* 8.3. *Saul* made havock of the Church: and *Acts* 12.1, &c. It was not any *particular* Church, but any of any *Churches*, any of that way, *Acts* 9.2. which must needs signifie the Church *indefinitely* as opposed to the *World*, not any particular Church: Nor was it the *Catholike Invisible* Church that they persecuted, as such; for they could not *know* them to be such: Therefore it must be the *Catholike Visible Church*. Besides, your self unawares confesse it, in the following words; ["Though "the whole Church, (or which is all one, the Catholike Church) "may be visible, in her singular members, *&c.*] Is not this to confesse a Catholike visible Church? But (say you) ["So they "are not a Church: or though it may be visible in the severall "particular Congregations, yet none of them is Catholike.] I hope you do not imagine, that any is *so simple*, to think that the *whole Church* can be seen at once; D. *A.* said well, *Ecclesia non est tota simul visibilis*: The Church (he means the *Catholike Church*) is not all visible at once or at one view: then it were more then *visibilis*, even *visa*: not visible so much as seen; I know you observe the difference: But if the whole Church be *visible* in her members, whether in the particular persons, or particular Congregations, is not the whole *visible*, though not *visa*, seen at once? No more is the *whole world* visible, but in its parts, yet the world is visible: No more is a *Congregation* of many persons vilible, that is, seen at once; yet you will not say but the *Whole* is visible. True, but then *none* of those particular Congregations are Catholike. ["The Catholike Church, is not "visible as a Church, and the Church that is visible, is not Ca-"tholike.] But 1. If there be a *Catholike Church*, (which you suppose here in these words,) 2. If that *Church* be visible in its *parts*, the singular members, which you also grant. 3. If the *particular* Congregations, as parts, be also visible, as *Churches*. 4. If the *whole Church* be made up of those particular Churches which are visible: must not the *whole*, or (which is all one) the *Catholike Church* be visible? and then the whole Church that

is visible, in its parts, is also Catholike: and the *Catholike Church* is visible in its parts: And is it not then true, that there is a *Catholike visible Church?* It might be added, that a *particular* Church, is not *visible* as a Church; but as a company of men assembled; for the *form* of the Church (which you say is the Covenant) is not visible. And once more you seem to yeeld the *Catholike visible* Church, when you say, [" Though " all of them (the particular Congregations) may be cal- " led a Catholike Church, or generall Assembly, if they were " met together.] Only you adde, [" Yet I would be loth to " say, that Christ giveth the power of the Keys (all Ecclesiasti- " call power into their hands.] I should indeed be loth to say so; for I do not yet believe, that our Saviour in that Text did give the *power* of the Keys to the Church at all, whether particular or Catholike, but to *Peter*, to the Officers for the Church, *To thee* (Peter) *I give the Keys of the Church*, &c.

Yet the question upon that Text is not resolved; whether by *Church* is meant the *Catholike visible* or *invisible* Church: seeing it is not to be taken for a *particular Church*] And to this you say, That I [" distrusting the meaning to be of the Catho- " like visible Church, expound it rather to be meant of the In- " visible mysticall Church] But 1. By my word [*rather*] I did not exclude the *Catholike visible* Church: though I was swayed by the reason annexed, to incline to that sense; Because that Church only is *built on the rock*, and against that, the gates of hell shall never prevail, whereas particular Churches may fail. And I am not alone in this Exposition. 2. *Visible* and *invisible*, do not *specifically* difference Churches, but are (as your self say, somewhere) but *adjuncts* of the same Church: whereupon it may be true of both, that, by the *Kingdom of heaven*, that is, the *Church*, ver. 18. may be meant both these, as included in the same Church: the *invisible* in the *visible*: But of which our Saviour understood it, is worth enquiry: Upon second thoughts (not excluding the *invisible*) I encline now to think he meant it of the *Catholike visible* Church. The Reverend M. *Hooker* confesses himself inclined that way, by some passages of M. *Rutherford*, to take it of the visible Church; (though he deny a *Catholike* visible Church, as well as you) by the force and

conviction

conviction of this Argument. [" That Church is here meant, " which is built upon the Rock Christ, by the visible confession " of *Peter*; But the invisible Church is not built by a visible " profession, such as *Peters* was: The proposition is made " good by the meaning of the words: Thou hast made a con- " fession of my self a rock, and upon my self so confessed, will " I build my Church.] I must ingeniously confesse, I am not convinced by this argument. For the *Invisible Church* is also built upon that rock by a *visible profession*, such as *Peters* was: The invisible Church is the same Church, or the same members, with the visible; and are all built upon the same rock by the same profession of faith; True beleevers and false make the same profession of faith, and the *Elect* are visible members of the Church, though as they are *elect* they are invisible: visible and invisible are in themselves opposite, but not inseveral respects, they may predicated of the same subject; That which I observe from him is this, he acknowledgeth and argues, that the *visible Church* is here meant: the question is whether the Catholike or particular visible Church is there intended: For the *Catholike visible* much hath been said already; and now I adde from his confession; [" Upon my self so confessed, will I build my Church.] what? only a particular Church, and not rather the whole Church? yea, rather the latter; for the reason objected against the particular Church; because against the visible *Church* particular the gates of hell have prevailed: he answers, [" The visible Church " is attended in a double respect: either as this or that particu- " lar Congregation, or else as a Church universall, existing in " the particulars: and in this latter sense it is taken in this place, " and then it is a sure and confessed truth, That the visible Church " doth not fail.] If now it be taken in the latter sense in this place, for the *Church universall*, existing in the particulars, then it is meant of the *Catholike visible* Church, not of a particular visible Church. See more in M. *Hookers* Survey p. 217. If I may now declare my judgement, take it thus: Upon this rock, that is, my self thus confessed, or this confession of my self, [" To be " the Christ the Son of the living God.] will I build my (*Evangelicall*) Church: The Church before Christs coming was built upon the same foundation, with this difference, They professed *Ibid* p. 2. 7.

the Messiah to come, The seed of the woman to break the serpents head, was the *foundation* of their faith from the beginning, till *Abrahams* time: After that, this was laid as the foundation [" *In thy seed shall all the nations be blessed,* &c.] But the Christian or Evangelical Church is built upon this Gospel-foundation or Truth [" That this particular person Jesus Christ " is the Sonne of God, and that Messiah which was to come.] So the woman of *Samaria*, Joh. 4. 29. *Is not this the Christ?* and vers. 42. [" *We know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour* " *of the world.*] In like manner the Eunuch, *Act.* 8. 37. [" *If* " *thou beleevest, thou mayst; And he answered, and said, I beleeve* " *that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*] And upon this rock, or Jesus Christ, so confessed, was every particular * member converted, built, and consequently the Church: What Church? a particular Congregation? yes, secondarily, as a part of the whole visible Church, but primarily, the whole Church of the New Testament, and that I take to be especially the sense of the word *Church*, in this Text, though (as I said) not excluding the *Invisible* Church.

* Women also as well as men.

And herein your self seem to agree with me, when you say, [" Indeed true it is, that *Peter* and other Preachers of the Gospel have received such a power of the Keys, to open to beleevers a door into the invisible Church, *&c.*] But then, the invisible Church cannot be excluded from one part of the meaning of the kingdom of heaven, whereof *Peter* received the Keys: and consequently the *Church* to which the Lord Jesus committed the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven, *Mat.* 16. 19. is not only *catus fidelium*, commonly called a particular Church (if at all) which was your assertion. And once more, it may be said, that the *visible* Catholike Church cannot be excluded from one part of the meaning of the Kingdom of heaven, in that Text, for the reason which you give also; Because there is a *power* of the Keys to open a door to professt beleevers, into the *Catholike visible* Church, as well as into a *particular* visible Church. But be it meant of the *invisible* or *visible* Catholike Church, or of a *particular* visible Church, it's manifest, that in this Text the Keys are not given to the Church; but the Keys of the Church are given to *Peter*, contra-distinguished, as an Officer, from the Church.

But

But you object, [" Certain it is, that when by the power of " the Keys a beleever is received into the invisible Church, he " can never be shut again out of that Church: but the Keys " here given to *Peter*, have a power to shut out of the King- " dom of heaven even the same persons: And therefore the " the Kingdom of heaven is not meant only of the invisible " Church.] I pray Sir, should not your conclusion be from those premises [" Therefore the Kingdom of heaven is not meant " at all of the invisible Church:] which yet you have asserted, to be part of the meaning: And did you not from the beginning say, that by *Kingdom of heaven* here, was meant the Kingdom of grace and glory: And doth not the Text say, that *Peter* hath keys given him, as well to shut out of the Kingdom of heaven, as to open the door thereof? [" Whatsoever thou " shalt binde on earth, shall be bound in heaven: If so; then your proposition is not true, That a beleever received into the *Invisible* Church, can never be sent again out of that Church: Your self say, a little below, *pag.* 8 of this second part. [" It may " truly be said, whosoever is bound or loosed in any one particu- " lar Church, is also bound in the Kingdom of glory] and is not that, as much as to be *shut out* of the *Invisible* Church? You cannot but know, that the judgment of Divines is, that if a *true beleever*, be excommunicated, for some crime, he is for a time *suspended* from the Kingdom of Heaven, and so in a sense put out of the *Invisible* Church; and if it were possible for him to die unrepenting, he might perish; and the *text* it self seems to justifie it, when it sayes, [" whatsoever is bound on earth, shall be " bound in heaven]

See M. *Hookers* Survey part. 1. p. 204. Sect. Visible Saints.

And now I shall consider what you say to the *reasons* for my Assertion; The first was, because that Church, there meant, was built upon the rock, *&c.* To which you answer; [" It is not " true that the Invisible Church onely, is built upon a rock. For " particular Churches are built upon a rock also: built they are " upon Divine Institution, and Christ is laid for the foundation " of them, *&c.*] Before I answer, I must distinguish of those words [*built upon a rock*;] which not observed, cause confusion in this present businesse: Two things are here enquirable: 1. What is meant by the *Rock*? It may be taken 1. For *Christ* himself,

Obj. 1.

himself, the tried and sure *foundation*, (as he is elsewhere called,) and so it may be understood, *Matth.* 7. 24. [*built his house upon a rock*,] opposed there to the *sand*. 2. For *Christ confessed* to be the Sonne of God, and the *Messiah*; as he was by *Peter* professed to be; [upon my self so confessed, will I build my *Church*] as Mr. *Hooker* expoundeth it above. 2. What it is to be *built* upon the rock? It is, either by *internall union*, with Christ, as the rock and foundation; or by *externall profession*; as your self insinuate to me the distinction, *pag.* 7. when you say, ["if they degenerate, they were never founded upon Christ, but in an outward form."] And now, I shall ingeniously acknowledge my self not *distinct* enough, when I said, ["It is the Invisible Church, which is built upon the rock, *&c.*"] and do confesse my self beholden to Mr. *Ruth.* and Mr. *Hooker*, for this light; and now see, that the *visible Church* also, is built upon the rock. Onely I differ from Mr. *Hooker* in this, that he by *visible Church*, means only, a particular Church, but I, the *Catholike visible* Church, as was discoursed above. But now, upon the former distinctions, I answer, That if you take the *Rock* for Christ himself, and the building on him, for *Internall* union with him; then the *Invisible* Church onely, is built upon the *rock*, and against that the gates of hell shall never prevail. But if you understand the *Rock*, to be that *confession* of *Peter*, or rather *Christ*, so confessed, as he was by *Peter*; and the building on that *foundation*, for an external profession, or (in your words) in an *outward form*: Then I say, the *visible* Church is so founded upon the rock: But then I adde, that it must not be restrained to a *particular* Church (against which the gates of hell have prevailed, which contradicts our Saviours promise) but declared to the *Catholike visible* Church (existing in the particulars, as M. *Hooker* said) against which the *gates of hell* (what ever they be) shall never prevail. And now I consider what you say, ["It is not true, *&c.* for particular Churches are built upon a rock also:] But then Sir, I pray, how will you (without a distinction) answer the Text, which sayes, the *gates of hell* shall never prevail against that Church which is built on the rock? You say ["Built they are upon divine institution, *&c.*"] But I suppose you do but *elude* and not answer here: Is it all one to be built upon the

Vide D. *Ames. Medul.* lib. 1. c. 34. s. 11.

See *part.* 2. *pa.* 24. your own words, *It is readily*, &c.

the *rock*, and upon divine *inſtitution*? Then particular Churches ſhould not fail; for thoſe that are built upon a *rock* ſhall never fail: Particular Churches are built upon a rock alſo; True, ſo far as they are true beleevers: Others of them are expreſly ſaid to be built upon the *ſand*; yet are they built upon *Chriſts inſtitution*: Suppoſe a *particular* Church, conſiſting of all *hypocrites*, (it's poſſible to be ſo) having all externall Ordinances; will you ſay, thoſe are built upon the rock Chriſt? or will you ſay, they are no Churches of Chriſt, becauſe they are not built upon Chriſt as a rock or foundation? Neither of theſe can you ſay, not the latter, for they are built upon the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt; not the former, for hypocrites have not Chriſt for their foundation, but are built upon the ſand. Hear your own words, *pag.* 40. ["If the profeſſion of the doctrine of faith be true, though the "grace of faith in the profeſſour be uncertain, and may be hy- "pocriticall, and ſo falſe, yet we dare not deny the nature and "power of a Church to ſuch.] But ſay I again, ſuch are not founded upon the *rock* Chriſt, though they be upon his *Inſtitution*: Therefore *Inſtitution* and *rock*, are not both one. But you confute your ſelf, when you ſay ["Chriſt is not the head of "that Church, whereof he is not the foundation, and where he "is the foundation, he is alſo the rock:] Now (ſay I) Chriſt is not the head of hypocrites, therefore not the *foundation*, nor the *rock*, for (as you adde) Chriſt is not a *ſandy foundation*: yet are they built upon the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt; and may and do fail, which they could not if they were built upon Chriſt a rock: But ſay you ["What then? ſo may the true diſciples of "Chriſt fail (in reſpect of bodily ſubſiſtence) and yet the "gates of hell never prevail againſt them,] Did Chriſt mean in regard of bodily *ſubſiſtence*, that the gates of hell ſhould not prevail againſt the Church? Do not ſome particular Churches fail in regard of the truth it ſelf, and the gates of hell prevail againſt the ſouls of all their members? yet Chriſt ſayes, they ſhall not prevail againſt the Church built upon the rock. Or rather did he not mean it of the *Catholike viſible* Church, in this ſenſe; that he will ever have a Church in one place or other? yes, ſay you ["God may remove the Candleſtick, that is, his "particular Church, yet he will have ever ſome or other par-

"ticular Churches visible, in one place or other.] That is, say I, God will have ever a Catholike visible Church, existing in the particulars: and so (sayes M. *Hooker*) the visible Church doth not fail. Yet you go on to say, ["Those Churches that were "founded upon Christ, and built upon that rock, neither failed "nor fell away.] But (I assume) those Churches that were founded upon his *Institution*, fell away and failed, therefore they were not built upon the rock. You adde again ["If the "posterity of a holy Church do degenerate, they were never "founded upon Christ, but in an outward form] True, say I, yet they as well as their predecessors were built upon Christs *Institution*. Therefore to be built upon divine *Institution* meerly, is not the same, as to be built on a *rock*: And so you have *eluded*, not answered the argument.

I have but one thing more to say to your Testimonies from Mr. *Whit. Junius*, and *D. Ames*: You say, ["They dispute "against a Catholike visible Church, but maintain the Catho-"like Church to be invisible] But 1. The Church Catholike of which those Divines speak, against Papists, is not the same with ours in this Dispute: They intend it of the Church of the Elect, of all ages and times, which is the Catholike Church mentioned in the Creed, as the object of our faith, not of our sense: but we take it in the second sense, delivered in the beginning, for the whole multitude of beleevers, or professours of the Gospel in all places of the world at once; And the parts of this Church whether particular members or particular Congregations being visible, the whole (or which is all one, the Catholike Church) must needs be visible. And D. *Ames* by name, having defined this Church to be *Cœtus hominum vocatorum, fidelium, vel cœtus eorum qui sunt in Christo, &c.* Of this same Church (which cannot be only the particular Church, he saies, it is *visibilis in suis partibus*: and in the former chapter, *Sect.* last, *Ecclesia nunquam planè desinit esse visibilis*: The Church Catholike (of that he spake) never wholly ceaseth to be visible. 2. The Catholike Church which they dispute against, is in the *Romish* sense, a Catholike *Romane* Church, animated by the Pope as an head, and by Catholike Officers actually, in a subordination, as a *Politicall* body: But this we deny as well

D. *Ames. Med.* lib. 1. cap. 31. sect. 7. cap. 32. sect. 1.

as

as they. We take it only for the whole *multitude* of beleevers, distinguished into severall Congregations, which all make up *one body*, whereof Christ alone is the *Head*. We shall take it in M. *Hookers* words, [" The Church is the visible kingdom of " Christ, in which he reigns by the Scepter of his Word and Or- " dinances, and execution of discipline,] which visible kingdom of Christ, is the *whole Church*, or (which is all one) the Catholike Church, visible in her members. Survey *part.* 1. *pag.* 15, 16. Of which Christ is an Head by political government

And now I come to my second Reason, or (as you call it) Objection, The kingdom of glory (one part of the meaning of the Kingdom of heaven, *Mat.* 16. 19.) is not *contra-distinguished* to a particular Congregation, but to the *generall* visible Church on earth. You answer 1. [" There is not any particular " Church on earth, but may be, upon just occasion contra-di- " stinguished from the kingdom of glory] It may be so, but very *improperly*, and with respect to the *whole Church* on earth: But what's this to the Text or Objection? The question is not, what may be elsewhere, but what is the meaning in this Text: It saies not, whatever thou shalt binde in a *particular Congregation*, but in earth, that is, the *visible Church* on earth, as contradistinguished to the *world* here, and the kingdom of glory above: And besides, he that is bound in any particular Church, is bound in all the Churches on earth; and so the distinction of heaven and earth respects the whole Church, rather then any particular Church. 2. And this your second Answer implies, [" You did not mean it in any one single Congregation on " earth, but generally and indefinitely in every particular Church " on earth; for every Apostle had transcendent power in eve- " ry particular Church on earth.] But 1. why may you not say as well [" generally in the whole Catholike Church on earth.] seeing *Peter* received power to binde and loose, in the *whole Church* primarily (being an Apostle) and secondarily in particular Congregations? 2. If *Peter* as an Apostle received such power in the *whole Church*, what is that to *Elders* and *Beleevers*; to challenge power of the *Keys* from this Text, in all particular Congregations? Sure, they have not *transcendent power* indefinitely, much lesse generally, in every particular Church on earth. 3. How did *Peter* receive the Keys in every particular *Obj.* 2. See the Keys pag. 2. s. 1.

Church

Church indefinitely? As an Apoſtle, or as an Elder, or as a beleever? Not as an Apoſtle or Elder; that you denied in the way? Not as a Beleever, for if they have any power in the Keys, it is in the particular Congregation. Whence I conclude, by *Kingdom of heaven* there, is not meant a particular, but the *Catholike viſible* Church, as contra-diſtinguiſhed to the Kingdome of glory.

Obj. 3, That Church is meant (ſaid I) whereof *Peter* was one, but *Peter* was not a member of a particular Congregation; for there was none ſuch then extant. You are pleaſed to jeer me with your Logick; and tell me [" there is a fallacy in ſuch ar- " guing, to be left to Sophiſters, or uſed, when I will refreſh " my wit with young ſcholars:] But I pray Sir, where lies the fallacy? The major is your own, the minor cannot be denied; *Peter* was not a member of a particular Congregation. The proof of this laſt Propoſition is, becauſe there was none extant at that time: This is alſo true, and partly confeſſed by your ſelf, where then lies the fallacy? [" The *Copula* doth conno- " tate Time, which it ought not to do, *&c.*] You inſtance in a *Sophiſm*; fit indeed for young ſcholars: But nothing parallel to my arguing: And your other Argument from the *reſurrection* is as far wide: you ſay [" The Propoſition is true, becauſe the ſubject " and prædicate have true connexion in the nature of the thing " though not in the preſent order of time.] But ſo it is not in my arguing; For *Peter* was not at any time a member of a particular Congregation, neither then nor afterwards: There was then no fallacy or ſophiſm in my arguing; The weakneſſe was in the proof; For whereas I ſaid, *Peter* was not a member of a particular Congregation, becauſe there was none extant at that time; I ſhould have ſaid, *Peter*, being an Apoſtle, was never a member of a particular Congregation; Therefore the Church there mean could not be a particular Congregation

Obj. 4. I ſaid Fourthly, That Church whereof *Peter* received the *Keys*, was ſuch, whereto an offended brother might tell an offence, and have it cenſured; but that was never done in a Church of Saints, without Officers, *&c.* [" This (ſay you) is " another paſſage of Sophiſtry: Here are *quatuor termini* in this " Syllogiſm:

"Syllogiſm: might tell an offence, and did tell an offence, make "two different *Mediums.*] Make you the Syllogiſm right as you would have it; you make the minor thus, ["But the "Church of Saints without Officers was not ſuch, to whom an "offended brother might tell an offence, and have it cenſured.] And this you deny. But I ſhall prove it thus. 1. From the judgement of your brethren here, who ſay, ["The brethren cannot "proceed to any publike cenſures without Officers:] Therefore it is to no purpoſe to tell an offence to a *Church* of beleevers without Officers. 2. From your ſelf, who expreſly ſay: ["Excommunication is one of the higheſt Acts of Rule, "and therefore cannot be performed, but by ſome Rulers:] The Keys pag. 16. though I confeſſe, you flatly contradict your ſelf in the *way*, pag. 101. And now my Syllogiſm may eaſily be defended and cleared from a Sophiſm, by adding the minor more explicitly, thus, ["But a Church of Saints without Officers, is not ſuch a "Church:] This is proved by what I ſay, That was never done in a Church of Saints, without Officers; that is, no example can be brought from Scripture or Hiſtory, of ſuch a practice, where a Church of Saints without Officers did cenſure an offence; Therefore the Church of *Corinth* (which you inſtance in) was not ſuch a Church, for it had Officers, who (as I ſaid) might *authoritatively* cenſure offenders. ["What of that? (ſay you) "if a Church of Saints without Officers, have power from Chriſt "to elect Officers, then alſo to admit members; And if to ad- "mit without Officers, then to exclude them without Offi- "cers:] Surely, whatever mine was, this is a fallacy and a Sophiſm, called *petitio principij:* For you know, we deny, that a Church of Saints without Officers, have power to *elect*, that is, ordain and make Officers, and you ought not to beg it. And what mean you by *power* to admit members? Admiſſion of members is either at their *firſt converſion*, which is done by baptiſm, and ſo your ſelf ſay, None but Officers can admit, for none but Officers can *baptize*; or it is at the removall of a member from one Church to another, to admit into the communion of another Church; but this, either is no part of the *power* of the Keys, or if it be, it belongs to a *Church* with Officers. Nay, your argument will recoil upon your ſelf, It is the ſame

power to open and ſhut, to admit and exclude; But a *Church* of Saints without Officers cannot exclude or ſhut out, therefore nor can they admit or open. The *minor* is your own a little above, and your brethrens alſo: [" *Excommunication* being an " Act of Rule, cannot be performed but by ſome Rulers.]

And here I deſire you to take notice, That a great ground of your miſtakes, lies in the *miſapplication* or *attribution* of the *power* of the Keys to the brethren, to elect, that is, to make and ordain their own Officers; making election the principall, and ordination but a circumſtance or ſolemnity, not neceſſary by the *Inſtitution* of Chriſt, to belong to the Officers. Indeed, it ſeems to follow rationally, They that may *ordain* their own *Officers*, may *de-ordain them*, or caſt them out; for it is the ſame power *inſtituere & deſtituere*, as you ſay: And then if the brethren may ordain and de-ordain their Officers, much more may they admit or exclude members. But me thinks the *Antecedent* is to be denied, and we prove it thus: They that may ordain Officers to ſuch employments, may in caſe of neceſſity at leaſt formally themſelves perform them: But you conſtantly deny, that any but Officers can adminiſter Sacraments: The major is alſo your own Aſſertion, in this laſt book of yours thus you ſpeak [" I confeſſe, I do not well underſtand " how a man in caſe of neceſſity hath any virtuall power to this " or that Act, but he hath alſo a formall power to do ſuch an " Act in that caſe of Neceſſity.] But (I aſſume) the brethren in a caſe of Neceſſity (ſay you) have a virtuall power to *ordain* their Officers, who can doe thoſe Acts, adminiſter Sacraments, *&c.* therefore in that Neceſſity, when they have no Officers, they have a formal power to adminiſter Sacraments. Nor can I ſee any reaſon why thoſe that may ordain Officers, and adminiſter cenſures without Officers, may not alſo adminiſter Sacraments. For to adminiſter Sacraments is one of the *loweſt acts* of a Miniſter, certainly leſſe then preaching [" Chriſt ſent me " not to baptize but to preach the Goſpel,] *q. d.* that was the chiefeſt part of his errand, ſaies M. *Hooker*. And Excommunication (and ſo admiſſion of Officers by Election) is one of the *higheſt acts* of Rule, (ſay you:) But you allow your brethren to preach, and to elect, and caſt out *Officers*; therefore they may

The Way, pag. 44. and then par 2. p. 3.

Par. 2. pag. 33.

Par. 1. pag. 81.

as

as well if not better be allowed to administer Sacraments; which yet you do deny. How *Independent* indeed is your way? how *inconsistent* your doctrines? I wish you would at last consider it. *Obj.* 5.

I said in the fifth place, The *Church* to which the *Keys* are given, are said (by you) to be such as do all of them meet in one place, for the administration of the Ordinances of Christ. But the Ordinances of Christ are not to be found, much lesse administred in a Church of beleevers without Officers: Therefore. To this you answer thus, ["The truth is, though the Ordinances "may not all of them be administred in a Church of beleevers "without Officers, as authoritative dispensing of the Word "and censures, and ministration of Sacraments: yet some Ordi- "nances may be found and administred there:] But Sir, 1. Did not you intend it of all Ordinances, that they may and must be administred in a Church of beleevers? Did you not define a *Church* to be a company of beleevers met together to enjoy all Ordinances? 2. I said (all) the Ordinances are not to be found in a Church of beleevers without Officers, you first take no notice of that, but say, *though all may not be administred there:* and then confesse, *Some of them cannot be found* and administred there: Surely those that cannot be found there (as some cannot) cannot be administred there: But (say I) in that Church to which the *Keys* were given, all Ordinances (which are the *Keys*) may be found and administred: Therefore that Church and yours are not the same: 3. What are those *Some Ordinances* which may be found there? ["1. Two or three to "meet together, and pray, and admonish one another, *&c.*] But are two or three a Church? You say somewhere 7. are the least number. And may not any two or three beleevers, not in your *Church-order*, no members of any particular Church, meet and pray, *&c?* have they then the power of the *Keys?* Is not reading of the word also an Ordinance of Christ, and singing of Psalms, *&c.* Are these also part of the power of the Keys? ["2. It is an Ordinance of Christ to elect Officers, for this is "the power and priviledge of the Church of Brethren] Let me use your own words to me in this paragraph ["This latter "proposition is left naked and unguarded without proof, and is but an *ipse dixit*, &c.] for you know we deny it. And suppose

thoſe were Ordinances, and part of the power of the Keys, yet they are not the Ordinances that I intended, *viz.* adminiſtration of Sacraments and cenſures: Theſe you have confeſſed (though you again deny it) are not to be found or adminiſtred in a *Church* without Officers; ["The truth is (your own words) the Or-"dinances of Chriſt may not all of them be adminiſtred in a "Church without Officers, as authoritative diſpenſing of the "word and cenſures, and miniſtration of Sacraments:] what need I prove my latter propoſition when you confeſſe it? But you have an help for this: ["If a Church of beleevers may "ſupply themſelves with Officers, when they want them (*which* "*you know we deny, unleſſe you mean they may procure themelſe-*"*where*) and if Officers and brethren have all ordinary Church-"power (*which we alſo deny to the brethren*) and ſo all Ordi-"nances of Chriſt, which are ordinarily adminiſtred, found "there, then what hindereth, but that a Church of beleevers "hath in it, as ſome Ordinances formally, ſo all radically and "virtually, and the ſame adminiſtred, and adminiſtrable amongſt "them?) This diſcourſe is a meer begging, of the queſtion firſt, and then a varying of it: A begging in that you take for granted, that the Brethren have a power in the Keys, either formally or radically; and that becauſe they have a power to elect their own Officers; If by *Election* you mean the *Creation* or making of Officers, we deny then any ſuch power: If you mean a *deſignation* or choice of a fit perſon, to be ordained by other Officers, that is no *power* of the Keys; which your ſelf ſay ["are "the Ordinances of Chriſt, as the preaching of the Word, and "adminiſtring of the Seals and cenſures,] You alſo *vary* the queſtion, by putting in two words; firſt, *ordinarily adminiſtred*, whenas I ſpake of all Ordinances ordinary, as thoſe mentioned, or extraordinary, as *Synods*, which your ſelf acknowledge an Ordinance of God; and I think will not ſay it may be adminiſtred in a particular Church of beleevers, without or with Officers. Secondly, You ſhuffle in another word *Adminiſtrable* amongſt them; whereas the queſtion was of Ordinances adminiſtred; They are not all to be found, much leſſe adminiſtred in ſuch a Church: But all Ordinances, ordinary and extrordinary, are both adminiſtrable and adminiſtred in the Church, to which the

They are not capable of adminiſtration of Sraments without Offip 20, there.

The Keys, p. 2.

the *Keys* were given; therefore that and yours is not the ſame; and that and not yours is underſtood in that Text.

I ſaid further; If the Keys were committed to the Church, the particular Congregation, you muſt mean it either *objectivè*, for the uſe of the Church (but that's not to the purpoſe) or *ſubjectivè*, and then you fall into the extreme of Browniſts, *&c.* To this you anſwer, ["I meant it indeed *ſubjectivè*, though not "excluding *objectivè*: The particular Church receiveth the "power of the Keys, both *ſubjectivè* to it ſelf, and *objectivè* for "it ſelf:] But I reply, and ask, what you mean by *Subjectivè*, to it ſelf? and of what Church you intend it, whether *Entitive*, (as you ſpeak) conſiſting only of beleevers without Officers, or *politicall* with Officers? If you mean that the Church Entitive of beleevers without Officers is the ſubject of the Keys, then they have not only virtually but alſo formally received the Keys, and may adminiſter all Ordinances without Officers (which yet you deny) for *Peter* here received them all formally, and you ſay, as a beleever; then (ſay I) beleevers not only in a *Church* jointly, but even ſingly have received all the power of the Keys formally, and may adminiſter them without any Officers, which is worſe then Browniſm. But I have diſtinguiſhed above, when the Church is ſaid to receive the Keys *ſubjectivè*, it may be meant, either *immediatly* by her ſelf, without Officers; or *mediatly* by and in her Officers: and I illuſtrated it by the body naturall: As ſight is immediatly truſted with the eye, as the next ſubject of it; but mediatly with the body. In the firſt ſenſe, you cannot ſay, the Church is the immediate ſubject of the Keys; for then ſhe might immediatly adminiſter them all without Officers (as I ſaid) In the latter ſenſe, it is nothing to your purpoſe, for then, as ſight is entruſted with the eye, firſt for the good of the body, ſo the Keys are entruſted with the Officers for the good of the Church: The body is not firſt entruſted with ſight to convey it to the eye, nor are the Keys committed firſt to the Church, to convey them to the Officers. You ſay afterwards ["If Chriſt have given them (Paſtors, *&c.*) to the "Church, the Church is the Recipient ſubject of them. As if "the eye be given to the body, the body is the recipient ſubject "of it.] All this is true, in a ſenſe, The Officers are given to the

Obj. 6.

Par. 2. pag. 22.

Church as the immediate recipient subject of them: But is our Question of the Officers, or of the Keys? We say, the *Keys* are given to the Church both *objectivè* for its good, with reference to the brethren; and *subjectivè* with reference to the Officers: yea, *subjectivè* to the Church as the *subject* of the Officers, that is, mediatly; but not *subjectivè* as the *immediate subject* of the Keys: Your comparison was ill laid; you should have instanced in the *sight* (that resembles the *Keys*) not in the *Eye* it self: The body is the *immediate* subject of the eye: but the eye, of the sight. So the Church is the *immediate* subject of the Pastors, *&c.* but the *Pastors* are the immediate subject of the Keys. And this (as I have often said) is evident in the Text in hand; For Christ doth not say [" I give to the Church the pow-" er of the Keys, or the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven (that is, " of it self) but I give to thee *Peter* the Keys of the kingdom of " heaven, that is, of the Church:] not the least colour here, of giving the Keys to the Church. But I desire you will consider your inconstancy, and the inconsistency of your assertions. You say presently after the last words cited, [" Pastors, *&c.* are gi-" ven to the Church as integrall parts of the Church, as the " Church is *Totum Integrale*,] Then say I, they are not given to the Church as meer adjuncts, nor doth the *Church* receive them, as the subject of them. And that upon your own reason [" For " integrall parts are intrinsecall and essentiall to a *Totum Inte-" grale*, and not extrinsecall, as the object is to a thing.] Integrall parts are not *subjects* and *adjuncts* one to another.

Ibid. pag. 23. Materials of a Church, *&c.* pag. 27. See pag. 10. When the proposition, *&c.*

But you say [" When I wrote that proposition (in the first " words of the Way) it was not then in my minde to understand " any other, but a Congregation of beleevers with Officers; " For I spake of such a Church whereof *Peter* was one, and he " was an Officer.] 1. Whatever was in your minde, I know not, but the words hold out rather a *Congregation* of believers without Officers (and so that acute and judicious M. *Ruth.* understood you, as well as I) For you say there, [" The Church to " which Christ hath committed the Keys of the Kingdom, the " power of binding and loosing, the Tables and Seals of his Cove-" nant, and (mark that) the Officers and Censures of the Church, " is a communion of Saints, *&c.*] But can the Officers be committed

The Way, p. 1.

mitted to the Church with Officers? And do not you commonly distinguish Saints or beleevers from Officers? When you said, *Pastors* are given to the Church, and the Church is the recipient *subject* of them, must not the *Church* be taken then for a company of Saints without Officers? 2. In your present *defence*, you understand it all along of a *Church* without Officers, or I understand you not. 3. When you adde [" That you spake of such a " Church whereof *Peter* was one, and he was an Officer,] You vary the sense and words of the proposition. For there you say, [" The Church to which Christ committed the power, *&c.* was " a company of such (as whereof *Peter* was one) beleevers pro- " fessing that faith, *&c.*] Mark that, *one beleever*, not one Officer: And elsewhere you say, the *Keys* were committed to *Peter*, not as an Apostle or Elder, that is, not as an Officer but as a beleever. How these things agree, I see not: Yet you will defend it (granting that sense) [" They have received some part " of the Keys formally, *&c.*] Of which we have spoken before, and refer you thither. Only I shall observe your similitude for illustration of your assertion: [" The stock of the vine (grow- " ing from the root) hath not immediate power to bring forth " grapes, yet hath power to produce branches which do bring " forth grapes: So the body of the Church of beleevers, though " they have not immediate power of rule, authoritatively to " dispense the Word, or to administer Sacraments at all, yet " they have a power to produce such Officers as may perform " the same.] But I fear your *similitudes* do deceive you. Do the *Brethren* immediatly give that power to the Officers, which they have not formally in themselves? Did not the Officers receive their power immediatly from Christ or his Apostles, who had that power formally in themselves? Have not your '*Prefacers* to the Keys, told us, that your self lay this fundamentall Maxime, [" That look whatever power or right any of the pos- " sessours and subjects thereof may have, they have it each alike " immediatly (in respect of a mediation of delegation or depen- " dance on each other) from Christ, and so are each the first sub- " jects of that power which is allotted to them?] But now you make the Officers to depend immediatly upon the Church of beleevers; and to derive their power from them by mediation

Epist. to Keys, pag. 3.

or

or delegation, as the branches derive their being and vertue to produce grapes, from the ſtock of the Vine. Which if it be not to jump with the *Browniſts*, who place all power radically and originally in the Church of beleevers, and make the Officers derive it as their ſervants immediatly from them; I muſt profeſſe I underſtand nothing in this controverſie: Doth not M. *Hooker* make the *Church* of beleevers the firſt ſubject of all *Church*-power? and do not the Browniſts juſt ſo? whereas you (ſometimes at leaſt in the judgement of your brethren here, as afore) make two firſt ſubjects of the power of the *Keyes*, and each to have it immediatly from Chriſt: I deſire you would conſider whom M. *Hooker* meant in thoſe words [" That conceit is " more wide from the mark, *&c.*] pag 195, ſect. 2. It is ſtrange that all this while you ſhould agree no better.

Survey part. 1. p. 195. prop 4.

Obj. 7. I ſaid laſtly, The Church there meant is called the *Kingdom of heaven*, but a particular *Congregation* of beleevers is never called ſo: being but a member of it, *&c.* You anſwer, [" It is not " materiall, whether it be called ſo or no, it is enough it is called " a Church, yea, as diſtinguiſhed from *Church-Officers*, *Acts* 25. 22, 23. *&c.*] I gave the ſenſe and reſolution of that Text afore; The ſum is this, it doth not hold a *Church* of beleevers, as exiſting without Officers; for that Church had Officers: but only diſtinguiſheth the *Integrall* parts (as your ſelf call them above) of that Church into Officers and members; [" The Apoſtles, " Elders, and whole Church; *ver.* 22.] that is, the brethren or beleevers, *ver.* 23. *aſſembled together*, ver. 25. which is no more then if he had ſaid, the *whole Church*, conſiſting of Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren. But you muſt remember that you are diſputing the power of the *Keyes* to be given to a *Church* of beleevers without Officers; and you bring an inſtance of a *Church* that had Officers: Shew (if you can) a *Church* of beleevers, exiſting without Officers, which took upon them the name of a Church, or the title of the *Kingdom of heaven*. I yet beleeve, whereever the *Church* is called the *Kingdom of heaven*, in Scripture, it is meant of the whole Church, not of any particular Congregation. Your own Texts produced do hold out as much, *Mat.* 20. 1. It is called a vineyard, which ſignifies either the ſtate of the Goſpel, or the whole viſible Church; If he had

Supra, pag. 7.

meant

meant it of particular Churches, he would have rather ſaid, into his vineyards; for all thoſe Officers could not be hired for one particular *Church*: You ſay, [“It was into this or that particular Church reſpectively] true, with reſpect to the whole viſible *Church*, which is but one. A man that hath a large vineyard, hires ſervants to work, in ſeveral places or parts of that vineyard; but this or that part is not called a vineyard, but with reſpect to the whole, they are all hired to labour in his vineyard. Or what if that Parable be rather underſtood of particular perſons, then particular Congregations? God cals all Chriſtians into his *Church*, and ſets them to work; Some come in at one hour, ſome at another; they that come firſt, think they deſerve more, then they that come in late, at the eleveuth hour: Chriſt would intimate, that God is free, and his grace free to do what he will with his own; and there is no merit at all: Many are called but few are choſen: But your Expoſition reſtrains the parable only to Officers, as diſtinct from the Church of beleevers. The like may be ſaid of your ſecond Text, *Mat.* 25.1,2. It is not meant as an a deſcription of the eſtate of each particular Church, as you ſtrain, rather then interpret it: but of every particular profeſſing Chriſtian, whereof ſome have *lamps* of profeſſion, but no oyl of true grace; others have both: And the ſcope of the parable is intimated in the ἐπόδοσις or application, *ver.* 23. [“*Watch ye therefore* (every one of you) *for you know* “*not the day nor hour when the Son of man cometh,*] Your next of *Luk.* 17.21. is wider from the mark, [*The Kingdom of God* “*is within you,*] that is, either the Meſſias whom you ſeek as abſent, is now among you, as *Beza*, or the power of the Goſpel is within you or upon you. Thoſe other of *Rev.* 1.6. and 1 *Pet.* 2.9. are as much miſtaken, if applied to a particular Congregation. All the faithfull are Kings and Prieſts, and all together, are a *Kingdom of Prieſts*, both Officers and beleevers. I ſuppoſe you will not apply this either only to the *Officers*, or only to beleevers, but to both ſingly and jointly, and reſpectively to the *whole Church.*

To conclude this whole firſt Section, I added, a particular *Congregation* is but a member or Corporation of that kingdom: and it were as improper to call a *Congregation* Chriſts kingdom,

as to call *London* the kingdom of *England*, You answer, [“Every ſimilar part of a ſimilar body doth properly partake both “in the name and nature of the whole; Every part of water is “water, *&c.* and ſuch a part of ſuch a body is a particular viſible Church. But ſuch is not the ſtate of *London*, &c.] You ſaid a little above [“It was not in your minde to underſtand any “other particular *Congregation*, but one furniſhed with Offi-“cers:] But then if you will ſpeak properly and ſtrictly, you cannot ſay, that a particular Congregation of Officers and beleevers is a ſimilar part of a ſimilar body; for it is a diſſimilar body conſiſting of diſſimilar parts: and ſo *London*, and it, agree in ſtate; and that Church can no more properly be called the Kingdom of heaven, then *London* the kingdom of *England*. Again, if you will (to help your ſelf out of this Labyrinth) underſtand it of a particuar *Church* without Officers, you fall into another gulf as bad as the former. For if particular Congregations conſiſting of ſimilar parts (of beleevers only) may be called Kingdoms, as they are called *Churches*, then it will fairly follow, that every particular member of that ſimilar body, may be called not only a Church, but a Kingdom too; becauſe *every ſimilar part of a ſimilar body* (it is your own reaſon) *doth properly partake in the Name and Nature of the whole*: So then, as every drop of water is water, ſo every member of ſuch a Church, is a Church; and of ſuch a Kingdom, is a Kingdom. Your following of metaphors and Parables too far, is guilty of theſe miſcarriages; as I elſewhere often ſhew; where I alſo ſhew how a particular Church conſiſting of Officers and beleevers, may, in a candid ſenſe be ſaid to be a ſimilar body, to which I referre you.

Sect. II.

What the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are.

IF in opening what the *Keys* of the kingdom of heaven be, it was not your intent to enumerate them all diſtinctly and particularly, (as you here ſay) Surely you intended not the buſineſſe

you

you had in hand, when you were purpoſely engaged to anſwer this Queſtion. What are the *Keyes* of this Kingdom? would not any Reader expect (from an Expoſitor, of that text) a full and perfect *enumeration* of the Keys? what, and how many they are? Had you ſaid only thus [" The Keys are the Ordinances " which Chriſt hath inſtituted to be adminiſtred in his Church.] You might afterwards have referred them (as you ſay) to their ſeverall ſubjects. But when you adde [" As the preaching of the " Word, as alſo the adminiſtration of the Seals and Cenſures;] Would not any Reader take it for a full diſtribution of the Keys? And when you adde [" By the opening and applying of " theſe both the gates of the *Church* here, and of heaven hereaf- " ter, are opened or ſhut to the ſons of men.] Would not any man think, theſe were all the *Keys* neceſſary, and alſufficient for thoſe ends on earth and in heaven?

But (ſay you) ["In inſtancing theſe, I ſuppoſed no man would " be of ſo narrow apprehenſion, as not to conceive thoſe things " to be included, without which theſe cannot duely be perform- " ed. As vocation unto ſuch adminiſtrations, and ſome who " have power from Chriſt to give ſuch a vocation.] But I pray Sir, are theſe any part of the *Keys* themſelves? If a Steward be truſted with the Keys of the Family (as *Peter* with the Keys of the Church:) there muſt be doors and locks, and ſervants to be let in, or ſhut out; but are thoſe any part of the Keys? Mend your diſtribution of the Keys; and will you ſay, The Keyes are *vocation*, and ſome that have power to give ſuch a vocation? We (ſuch is the narrowneſſe of our apprehenſion) think your diſtribution afore-given, is full enough; nor can we tell (pardon our dulneſſe) how you can mend it, but you will make it worſe. We have been accuſtomed ſo long to that ancient diſtribution of *Clavis Scientiæ* (which you call preaching of the Word) and *Clavis poteſtatis* (which you call *Adminiſtration of Seals and Cenſures*) that we wonder at your new pick-locks, preſented to the world, as Keys of the *kingdom of heaven*. And I yet think, your new *diſtribution* labours under ſo many *Incongruities* (as *Vind. Clav.* hath given you to underſtand, though you are not pleaſed to take notice of them, or to vindicate them,] that it is far worſe then the old one, ſo long received in the Churches of

Christ. I had thought to have added your own words (appliable enough to your new distribution) in end of *Sect. 3. pag. 6.* of the *Keys*, but I forbear.

It seems to me (though you insinuate the contrary) to be of great weight for the expediting of many controversies about the Keys, and your *new Way*, to know what those Keys be, and what Ordinances they include. Is not one main controversie betwixt you and us, about the nature and extent of the Keys, and who are the Key-bearers? which cannot be decided, unlesse we know what be those Keys. But let us hear your new definition of the Keys: "Keys of the kingdom of heaven are spiritu- "all powers, to dispense the Treasures of his Kingdom, *&c.*] Is not this almost the same with that afore, *Keys* are the *Ordinances* of Christ to be administred in his Church, for opening and shutting the gates of the Church here, and of heaven hereafter? But what mean you by *spirituall powers*? you mean ["Spiri- "tuall callings and spirituall gifts fitting for them, enabling to "some spirituall Acts, for these are Ordinances.] I pray Sir, is every spirituall calling, and every spirituall gift fitting for them, a Key intended in the text to be given to *Peter*? callings and gifts help to dispense the Keys, but they are no *Keys*: But they are Ordinances? Be it so, is every Ordinance a *Key*? The Deacons office is an Ordinance (and the Widows too, say you) and *spirituall gifts* are requisite to fit for that calling; but is a *Deacon* or his *office* a *Key*? and a *Key* given to *Peter* in that Text? Prayer and singing are Ordinances, but who ever numbred them among the *Keys*? Well, what are the *Treasures* dispensed by those powers or *Keys*? ["I mean by them (say you) "the Word, Seals, and censures, *&c.*] Before you said the preaching of the word, and Administration of the Seals and Censures, were these *Keys*: and now you call them the *Treasurers* to be dispensed by the *Keys*: What incongruity is here? Now let us hear your *Distribution* of the *Keys*, according to this your definition: ["*Keys*, spirituall powers, are either the Key of "Knowledge or Faith (both one w th you) or the Key of Or- "der: The Key of Order is either the Key of power, or the Key "of Authority or Rule:] Is not this an accurate distribution? The *spirituall powers* are either *Keys* of power or of Authority?

And

And is not the *Key* of knowledge a key of order, an Ordinance peculiar to some order or office of men? what confusion is here? In a word, your new definition of the *Keys* better fits the *Key-bearers* then the *Keys* themselves, *ver.* 9. A Pastor or Teacher is a spirituall power given by Christ to his *Church*, to dispense the Treasures of his kingdom, *&c.* And your own Exposition fits it better: By spirituall powers is meant, *spirituall callings:* such is the calling of a Pastor: and spiritual gifts are requisite for the fitting of them to spiritual Acts: But no man ever said, that a *Pastor* was a *Key*, but a Steward to dispense the Keys. New waies must coin new notions and distinctions, to make them as amiable, as strange. But the *old way* is the good way.

1. And now you come to animadvert upon my animadversions; I said you confuted your scope in the whole book, which is to give the people a share in the government of the Church: This you peremptorily deny to be your scope, and say I mistake your meaning. Let your *Præfacers* speak first, [" His scope is to " demonstrate a distinct and several state, and interest of power, " in matters of common concernment, vouchsafed to each of " these (the Officers and people) and dispersed among both, " by charter from the Lord: as in some corporate Towns, the " Aldermen as Rulers, and a Common Counsell a body of the " people.] which that it amounts to a share in the Ruling power, is demonstrated in my *Vind. Clav.* in answer to that preface, and in the Tract it self; But you take no notice of it. Next, let your own books speak; wherein you often give the brethren without Officers power to ordain Officers, and to censure them all without Officers; which if they be not the *highest acts of Rule*, and so the brethren have the greatest share in the government, I shall still professe my *Ignorance* in this controversie. And upon my observation, you deny them power in nothing, but administration of Sacraments: You allow them power in jurisdiction, by giving them power in *admission* and *ejection* of members and Officers: You allow them liberty in preaching the Word, only not ordinarily, nor so authoritatively as to Pastor or Teacher: what can you give them more but administration of Sacraments; and that being lesse an Act of Rule, then the former, you may go on, and grant them that too; or they will take it, and so they do.

Præf. to Keys, pag. 3.

I ſaid, in proſecution of my charge, of your confuting the ſcope of your book, If the Keys be the Ordinances of Chriſt, (there by you ſpecified) preaching and adminiſtration of Sacraments and Cenſures, they are given for the Church of beleevers, *objectivè*, but are never in Scripture, or all antiquity ſaid to be given to the Church *ſubjectivè*: You are pleaſed to *deride* me, as if I had not read all Antiquity, which I profeſſe I have not (though in this particular controverſie it is eaſie to finde what Antiquity hath ſaid) or had forgotten what is recorded by the moſt ancient Antiquity, for the ſpace of the firſt three hundred years: But of that you vouchſafe not to give me any account, how pertinent ſoever to our preſent buſineſſe, but referre me to that account you have given M. *Baily*; to whom (in way of requitall, not of revenge) I ſhall referre you to wait for your unſwer.

But you ſay [" what power you give to the Church of be-" leevers *ſubjectivè*, you alledge Scriptures for it, which when " *Vindex* taketh in hand to evade them, you ſhall return him an " anſwer.] You did alledge Scripture, and the Aſſertor (not Avenger) did in their place anſwer them (not evaded them, as you phraſe it) and expected your reply; but I perceive he may go ſeek it, for you never come at the place, where it is handled; though you promiſe here, and once or twice more, you would do it; but either evaded it, or forgot it, of which more anon.

It ſounds very ill (I ſaid) at firſt hearing, to ſay, that the brethren have any power in the Keys, or Ordinances of preaching, or adminiſtring Seals or Cenſures: you anſwer, (" If thoſe, " preaching the Word, and adminiſtring Seals, were all the Or-" dinances, and no more, I ſay true, it would ſound ill at firſt, at " ſecond, and third hearing too, to ſay, The people have any " power to exerciſe theſe Ordinances,] *&c.* But 1. Why do you leave out *Cenſures*, which not only I put in, but your ſelf alſo, in defining the Keys? Does it not ſound ill, at firſt, ſecond, and third hearing, to all reformed Churches (but your own and ſuch like) that the people have any power, yea, the *greateſt power* to exerciſe cenſures? For they can cenſure all their Officers, but all their Officers without them cannot cenſure them, nor any

any one of them: It is indeed no unpleasant sound to you, or your people: yea, it would sound very ill and harsh to you, at least to your people, to hear, That they have no power in the Keys mentioned, preaching and administring of Seals and Censures. But if those Keys were given to *Peter*, they were given to him, either as an *Elder*, and then the people have nothing to do with them at all, one or other: Or as a Beleever, but then they may as well exercise the Ordinances of preaching and administring Seals, as exercise and administer the Ordinance of Censures.

But you go on, by way of *Recrimination* (I say not by way of *Revenge*) with an argument, *ad hominem* [" You marvell it " should sound so ill (to allow the people a power in censures) " to them whose ears have been wonted long, to hear of sus- " pensions and Excommunications, by Chancellors and Commis- " saries, who generally are no Ministers, *&c.*] Truly Sir, this toucheth not me, who have as well thought it to sound ill, at first or second hearing, that Chancellors, *&c.* no Ministers, should suspend and excommunicate, as I now think it harsh to hear, this power is allowed to, and practised by the people. Though people may perhaps be the better men, yet not so well authorized, as some Chancellors and Commissaries (for some of them were Ministers) who had more colour of Authority to suspend, *&c.* then your people have, who are quite out of office. But you wonder more that I that could alledge all Antiquity, should think it to sound ill [" Who know what reverend Te- " stimony, ancient *Tertullian* giveth of the Brethrens power, *&c.* " and what *Cyprian* gives to the people, *&c.*] I had thought to let you wait for your answer, from M. *Baily*; but seeing you are pleased to vouchsafe me the Testimonies, I shall anticipate his answer in the mean time. 1. For *Tertullians*, I finde you cite him not at all to M. *Baily*, as if then you took it to be of no great strength. What saith *Tertullian*? *Quum probi, cum boni coeunt*, &c. [" When honest, good, godly, chaste people, meet " together, it is not to be called a faction, but a Court.] What is this to power of the people in censures? Unless you begge it hence, that the word *Curia* signifies a Court? But I pray, what mention is here of Officers at all? Did the people at that time censure

censure alone without their Officers? You will hardly prove that: or are not Officers good and honest men? Or doe good men never meet but in a Court to censure? As for *Cyprian* you leave me in the dark, to go look what he sayes; or to turn back to what you say to M. *Baily*: I shall consider the place, and his Testimonies. In the first, you clearly to my understanding confute your own way of Ordination of Ministers: Thus *Cyprian* speaks ["As they have received from the Apostles, so "they hold it, that for the orderly celebration of Ordination, "all the neighbour Bishops of the same Province, where a Mi- "nister is to be ordained, come together to that people, *&c.* Of "*Sabinus* he saies, this Office was put upon him by the suffrage "of the whole brotherhood, and by the judgement of all the "Pastors present, *&c.* and so hands were imposed on him.] I pray, do you gather all the *neighbour Bishops* or Pastors of the Province, where a Minister is to be ordained? Do those Pastors impose hands upon him? yet these, *Cyprian* saies, they received from the Apostles. True it is, the Minister was chosen in the presence of the people, and good reason, as to whom his life is best known: But the judgement of his abilities was in the Pastors; as also the Imposition of hands. But the people had their Suffrage; that is nothing, but some rationall consent, or some manifestation of their approbation, not any authoritative vote, or ordination. But this is not the new way of Ordination; for you allow the brotherhood, suffrage, consent, judgement and imposition of hands too, upon their Officers. This you never received from the Apostles. Another Testimony is this: ["The "people fearing God, *&c.* have chiefly the power of chooſing "worthy Ministers, and refusing the unworthy.] But power of election of one Minister, rather then another, and rejection of an unworthy Minister, is not denied the people of God: That Election is but their consent or approbation of such a Minister, as the Pastors in their judgement, think fit and worthy: and Rejection is but withdrawing communion from one unworthy, and judged fit to be excommunicated. But this we say is no part of the power of the keys, we doubt not but pious and godly women should have this liberty or priviledge to except against known unworthy persons, and to withdraw communion from them;

See the Way. pa. 41. and 58.

them; yet surely, you will not allow them power in the Keys. When *Cyprian* saies [" All things shall be examined, you being " present and judging,] He means not a judgement of Authority, but of discretion. And the last place, [" I determined to " do nothing without your counsell and consent,] declares his meaning fully to be for consent, not Authority: And so those times give no expresse lineaments of Congregationall discipline. Shew us in any Antiquity of Scripture or story, that the people had power without Officers to create or ordain Officers, to impose hands upon them, or to censure all their Officers; or you say nothing to the present controversie.

2. When you had said [" The Keys convey not Soveraign " power, but stewardly,] I inferred, that this clearly excludeth the people, for they have no stewardly or ministeriall power over themselves (I might have added, much lesse over their Officers,) You answer by a question, [" As if the people were not Stewards of the grace of God given to them? *&c.*]. But truly Sir, this is no better then a fine elusion. To take *Stewards* in a larger sense then I intended it. *Stewards* to me are Officers, and can the people be *Stewards* over their Stewards? Your self say, *pag.* 28. [" It implieth a contradiction, that the Church " should be its own Officer, for the very term of Officer im- " plieth subordination.] So say I, it implieth a contradiction, that the Church should be its own Steward; And again, *p.* 30. [" We acknowledge (say you) that a company of professing " believers, destitute of Officers, are not Stewards by office, *&c.*] Then (say I) you answer equivocally; taking the word in another sense, then it is commonly taken in this controversie [" *Let* " *a man esteem of us as Stewards of the mysteries of God*, 1 Cor. 4. 1.] Did not the Apostle there mean it only of Officers? Nor will the Apostle *Peter* help you out: For either he takes *Stewards* in the strict sense for Officers, with reference to the 11. *verse*. Or in the large sense, for any *Dispensers* of any kinde of gifts, as the referring it to the 9. *verse* seems to carry it. Now we take the word in one sense, and you in another, and so you answer nothing, but misleade your Reader, while you evade. 1 Pet. 4. 10.

Yet you go on; [" If they have received any gift of grace,

they are either Stewards of it, or Lords.] Apply this to *women*, yea, to Infidels; If they have received any gift or grace, they are either Stewards of it, or Lords: Lords they are not; what are they else, Stewards? they are your own words. But we answer, it is not any gift that we are speaking of, but the gift of the Keys; that's your first evasion: And then we say, they are neither Stewards nor Lords, in our sense of Stewards, but members of the family, in subordination to the Lords and Stewards; having nothing to do with the Keys at all. But, say you, [" Election of Officers is a publike gift, and that must be dispensed " publikely,] Grant *Election* of Officers to be a publike gift, and yeeld it to the people, yet (say we) it is no part of the gift of the Keys. Lastly, when you say [" the people are not as " Lords, to elect whom they list, but as Stewards and Ministers " to Christ, *&c.*] either you make them Officers, or you doe prevaricate all along his Paragraph, and that I think you doe.

And the like you do in the word (*calling*) which I said should be taken of some *speciall calling* or Office, which would exclude the people from having an office in the Church, or any power of the Keys. You say, [" There is no reason for that, if spe- " ciall denote a specification of a calling, distinct from other " members of the Church: but if it only signifie a distinct state " or order, from such as are not members; so it is true, every " member hath a speciall calling, from such as are not yet recei- " ved as members of a particular Church.] But, Sir, you cannot well understand it otherwise then I do, when you speak of a speciall calling, in such, as to whom the *Keyes* are given, with a power to open and shut the gates of heaven, that is, the Church. For I suppose every member of the Church particular hath not such a speciall calling, or such power of the Keys, to open and shut the gates of heaven: as women and children for example: yet have they in your sense a speciall calling, state, or order in the Church; as was more fully said in *Vind. Clav.* And surely in this controversie *speciall calling*, and office, have ever been taken for the same thing, not for state, or place, or order, at large. Beleevers not yet members of a particular Church, have a distinct calling, in your sense, from Infidels, a state,

place,

place, order, in the visible Catholike Church: yea, if they be men, they have as good a state, order, &c. in a particular Church, as your women and children have, in regard of any power of the *Keys*.

Yet you say, ["Every member of a particular Church hath "a calling to put forth some acts of power in his own Church, "which members of another Church have not there:] Had you not said (*His*) I would have asked what acts of power women may put forth in their particular Church; yet certainly women may put forth some acts of power in their own Church; or else their calling, state, place, order, is very mean and contemptible. There is no member of the body naturall, not the least, but it hath in your notion, a function, action, office, in the body, a power to put forth some acts in its own body, which it cannot do in another body, nor the members of another body in its body. The question is not of some acts of power, but some acts of power of the Keys; which is an office power. But say you still, ["Every member of the body of a particular Church (women "and all say I) hath some function and action, or (as the new "Translation) Office in the body: *Ro.* 12.4,5. All the members "have not the same office; which implieth, they all of them c "have some office, though not the same.] Truly Sir, this is but a prevarication: Fos 1. By *body* there, is not meant a particular Church, but the whole Church: ["We, being many, are "one body in Christ, and every one members one of another,] *Paul* puts in himself, and he was no member of the Church of *Rome*, in your sense, 2. When they render the word πράξιν, *office*, they either mean it largely, and not for a *speciall office*, as we take it, or strictly, and then it relates to the Officers of the Church only, as the following verses may seem to insinuate, ["whether Prophecy or Ministry, &c.] where your self and others, do finde all the Officers of the Church: and so taken, it is nothing to your purpose, but rather against you.

When I said, you added that explication ["whether it be "their office, or place, and order in the Church,] to steal in the interest of the people, in some share of the Keys: you answer, ["It is not stealth but justice to give to every man his "own: the Psalmist foretold it in a new song, *Psa.* 159.9. Such

honour have all his Saints, *&c.*] But you must first prove it their own, and that that Text is so to be understood; or else it is as well sacrilege or stealth (taking it from the right owners) if the Lord hath not given them this honour: as it is to deny it, or take it from them, if the Lord hath given it to them.

Lastly, (and so you will have done with me) you conclude, ["It is not every place or order in the Church, that giveth power to receive the Ordinances, much lesse, power themselves to to dispense Ordinances: as children and women, *&c.*] This is very true: yet you asserted before: ["Every member of a particular Church hath a calling to put forth some Acts of power, in his own Church, *&c.*] Then say I, women and children, for they are members too: yea, we think, except but that of speaking in the Church, 1 *Cor.* 14.34. 1 *Tim.* 2.11, 12. expresly forbidden, and we do not finde any one thing granted by Christ (in respect of the power of the Keys) to men, the common members of the Church, that women may not be allowed to act; as I often told you, in *Vind. Clav.* 1. Women (widows at least, who contribute maintenance) may have some power in choosing (that is in your sense) ordaining Officers. 2. To propound just exceptions against such as offer themselves to be admitted. 3. To admonish in case of private scandall. 4. To judge with a judgement of discretion; you sometimes allow the brethren no more, *Keyes*, pag. 14. They may tell the Church, they may consent and concurre with the Elders at least passively. 5. To withdraw from one excommunicate, *&c.* as was suggested to you elsewhere. And now before I conclude, I shall set before you an observation of your *inconstancy*, in assigning the first subject of the power of the Keys; The Keys were given, 1. To *Peter*, as an Apostle, as an Elder, and as a beleever. 2. To *Peter*, not as an Apostle, nor as an Elder, but as a believer; and consequently to all believers. 3. Not to believers as believers, but as making publike confession of their faith, before the Lord and their brethren: *The Way cleared*, part. 2. pag. 39. and publike profession of their obedience of the faith, to the Lord Jesus, in the publike Ordinances of his worship, *pag.* 40. 4. Not to believers as believers, but as believers covenanting, and fitly capable according to Christs appointment; M. *Hooker* Surv. *par.* 1. *pag.* 203.

pag. 203. Or as you here; It is not every place, or order in the Church that giveth power to receive or dispense Ordinances; as not that place or order of children and women, *&c.* Whereas when first you began, you asserted, *The Keys were given to Peter as a beleever*, and so by your own argument, *a quatenus tale*, to all beleevers, as beleevers; you are forced to make severall distinctions, to help it out; That position that needs so many distinctions, gives strong suspition it is not the truth. And now I shall conclude this second Section with your own words, [" Let " every soul enjoy such priviledges and liberties, as the Lord " hath given him (or her) in their place and order, and neither " effect nor attempt more.] Happy had it been for the Church of God, if this had been done. I shall but minde you of what I suggested to you in *Vind. Clav.* pag. 13. in your own words: I pray you seriously consider, [" Whether by this sacrilegious " breach of order, investing the people with a Key of power, " even above those Elders that labour in the word and doctrine, " to open and shut the doors against them (*p.* 9. of *Keys*) (which " is the breaking of the files and ranks in an Army) Satan is not " like again to rout and ruine a great part of the liberty and pow- " er of Church-Officers, and the purity of the Churches, and of " all the Ordinances of Christ in them. The Keys, p. 6.

SECT. III.

I now expected, you should have gone on, with *Vind. Clav.* and have vindicated your book and self, from those other many wickednesses and contradictions, charged (I still think) justly upon you: But you fairly (if you doe not rather in way of Revenge,) shake hands with me, or rather slightly shake me off, and never meet again. And this is the more remarkable, because you promise at least three times (with attestation of the name of God twice at least) *pag.* 15. and *pag.* 16. and again, *pag.* 19 a further consideration of them. In the first place thus, [" when " *Vindex* takes in hand to evade the Scriptures alledged, I shall " return him (God willing) further answer:] In the second place thus again, [" What reason there is for their (the Bre- " threns)

"threns) power in Church-censures, we shall further consider "(God willing) in its place.] To which places you never come near; Is not this to take Gods Name in vain? And now in the third Section you promise, though you undertake those two Reverend Antagonists, M. *B.* and M. *Ruth.* ["Yet by "the way, not to neglect what personal exceptions *Vindex* hath "taken at your self;] But reading over the following discourse, I finde not that you do so much as take any notice of me, or your threefold engagement; but as if *Vindex* were some contemptible person, that deserved to be slighted, as his best answer; you neglect all his; I shall only say,

"*Etsi ego dignus hac contumelia vel maximè,*
"*At tu indignus, qui faceres tamen,*

Who both are charged with so many contradictions, which (for your own honour) it concerned you to answer; and also have charged your self three times to give a further answer. Besides this, there were seven Chapters in *Vind. Clav.* wherein you were not a little concerned to give (if not me) the world satisfaction: and you are pleased to answer (if you have answered) but to one, and but to two Sections of three in that chapter, which is a slighting and contempt of an adversary, not usually heard of. And now, I leave it to the Judicious Reader to resolve, who deserves best, and most justly, the name and title of *Vindex* or *Avenger*. Yet you give some reason of this slighting and neglect: for so you say, ["I conceive it losse of time and labour, "to argue the question with *Vindex* alone, whose exceptions so "far as they concern the point in controversie, are but collecti- "ons out of the writings of others; who have more distinctly "and elaborately disputed the cause:] I pray Sir, why do you conceive it losse of time and labour to argue this Question with me? Do you mean, your answers would be so unsatisfying (as the former now will appear to be) as that the time and labour would be ill spent? Your Reader will think so, if you answer no better to that remaining, then to what is gone before, And why do you say this Question? as if there were no more betwixt us then this, But I most of all admire why you should say, my exceptions are but collections out of the writings of others: I beleeve the Reader will finde my exceptions are Collecti-

Adversarius litis, non personæ.

ons

ons of contradictions, out of your own writings, more then out of others. And I can sincerely professe, I consulted with none, or very few books of this controversie, but comparing your books one with another, my own reason and judgement suggested to me those contradictions in them, that left me altogether unsatisfied in your way, and at this day, I am left so still; if not more confirmed; that the Independent way is not the way of God, that is so inconsistent with the Scriptures, and with it self.

That others have more elaborately disputed this cause, I shall easily yeeld; but I think I may truly say without vanity, none have more distinctly discovered the weaknesses of your proofs, and your contradictions to your selves, in holding out your Way, then I have done. Nor am I at all troubled that you chuse rather to consider what hath been written by Learned and Reverend M. *Rutherford* and M. *Baily* (though you serve M. *Baily* as you doe me, never name him more in all your following discourse) had you but made good your promises, to consider also what I had said, to vindicate your self from your contradictions, and to clear the truth in question. But seeing you are pleased so to neglect me, I hope you will not be troubled if I conceive it losse of time and labour to follow you any further; and consider what Learned and Reverend M. *Hooker* hath elaborately written in this controversie. Only give me leave to present you with a Scheme of your remaining contradictions, or contrarieties at least noted in *Vind. Clav.* out of your own books: and then leave you to your choise, whether you will reconcile them or confesse them.

A Scheme of Contradictions and Contrarieties in the Independent way.

1. THe Keys were given to *Peter* as an Apoſtle, as an Elder, and as a beleever. So the ſenſe moſt fill, The *Keys*, *pag.*4.

It appears, that Chriſt gave the Keys to the fraternity with the Presbytery, *Ib.* See alſo *the Way cleared*, par. 2. pag. 22.

1. The power of the Keys is given to *Peter* not as an Apoſtle, nor as an Elder, but as a profeſt believer, *The way* pag. 27.

1. *Peter* received no the Keys meerly as a be leever, but as a beleeve publikely profeſſing hi faith, *&c. The Way clea red*, par. 2. f. 39.

Not beleevers as belee vers, but as beleevers co venanting, and fitly capa ble according to Chriſt appointment, M. *Hooker* Surv. par. 1. p. 203.

2. The Keys are given to the *Church* of beleevers, *The Way*, p. 1. that is a combination of faithful men: as M. *Hooker*.

2. The Key of knowledge belongeth to all the faithfull, whether joyned to any particular Church or no. *The Keys*, pag. 11.

2. The Key of Know ledge is given not onl to the Church, but t ſome before they ente into the Church, *Th Keys*, p. 11.

3. The Key of order is common to all the members of the Church, *Keys* p. 8. Then (ſay we) to women and children.

3. It is not every place or order in the Church that giveth power to receive Ordinances, much leſſe to diſpenſe them, as children and women, *Way cleared*, par. 2. pag. 19.

4. Ordination is a work of Rule, *The way*, p. 49.

Ordination and juriſdiction (both acts of Rule) pertain indifferently to all the Presbysers. *Ib.* 49.

4. As for election and Ordination of Officers, *&c.* theſe things they (the brethren) may doe (if need be) without Officers: *The way* p. 45. 101.

4. Ordination is not a Act of ſupream juriſdi diction, but of order ra ther: in *H.* Survey part 2. 75.

5. The

5. The Key of authority or Rule is committed to the Elders of the Church, and so the act of Rule, is the proper Act of their Office, *The Keys* p.20.

The people discerning and approving the justice of the censure, give consent and obedience to the Will and Rule of Christ, *The Keys* pag.15. 37.41.

The brethren stand in an order, even an orderly subjection according to the order of the Gospel, *p.*11.

6. Excommunication is one of the highest Acts of Rule, and therefore cannot be performed but by some Rulers, *the Keys* p.16.

The Church cannot excommunicate the whole presbytery, because they have not received from Christ an office of Rule, without their Officers, *Ibid.*

No act of the peoples power doth properly binde, unlesse the authority of the Presbytery joyn with it, *Ibid.* 36.

5. In case the Officers do erre and commit offence, they shall be governed by the whole body of the brethren. *The Way*, pag.100.

The Church exerciseth severall acts of authority over the Elders, *The way* p.101.

The people have some stock of power and Authority in government of the Church, *the Keys*, pag.36.

They rule the Church by appointing their own Officers, *Ib.* p.16.

6. If all their Officers were found culpable, either in heretical doctrine, or scandalous crime, the Church hath lawful Authority to proceed to censure of them all, *The Way*, p.45.

In case of offence given by an Elder or whole Eldership together, the Church hath authority to require satisfaction, and if they give it not, to proceed to censure, *Ibid.* p. 101.

5. It

6. Excommunication is not an act of power of office, but of judgement: nor an act of highest rule, but of supream judgement seated in the fraternity, *Survey* par.3. p.45.

As a Church of brethren cannot proceed to any publike censures without Elders: so nor the Elders without concurrence of the people, *&c. Pref. to the Keys*, pag. 4.

7. It was a ſacrilegious breach of order, that Commiſſaries and Chancellors, wanting the key of Order (no Miniſters) have been inveſted with juriſdiction, yea, and more then miniſterial authority, above thoſe Elders, who labour in the word and doctrine, *The Keys*, p.6.

8. We are far from allowing that ſacrilegious uſurpation of the Miniſters office, practiſed in ſome places, that private Chriſtians ordinarily take upon them to preach the Goſpel publikely, *The Keys*, pag.6.

9. A particular Church of Saints, profeſſing the faith (that is, members without Officers) is the firſt ſubject of all the Church-Offices, with all their ſpirituall gifts and power, *The Keys*, p.31.

7. There is a Key of power given to the Church (with the Elders) as to open a door of entrance to the Miniſters calling, ſo to ſhut the door of entrance againſt them in ſome caſes, *&c. The Keys*, pag.9. yea, to cenſure all their Elders (without Elders) *the way* p.45. *&c.* as afore.

8. This is ordinarily practiſed in old *England*, and allowed by the Independent brethren. Yea, they being but in the notion of gifted brethren: no Miniſters to other Congregations, do it ordinarily themſelves.

9. As the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven be divers, ſo are the ſubjects to whom they are committed divers, *The Keys* p.11.

The Apoſtles were the firſt ſubject of Apoſtolical power, *Ib.* p.32.

A Synod is the firſt ſubject of that power whereby error is convinced and condemned, *&c.* ib. p.47.

9. The power of the Keys belongs firſtly to a Congregation of Covenanting beleevers, *Survey*, part. 1. pag. 219.

The power of the Keys is in the Church of beleevers, as in the firſt ſubject, *Ib.* p.195.

That concein is wide, to make one firſt ſubject of this power, and yet others to ſhare in this power, not by means of that; for this is to ſpeak daggers

10. Paſtor and flock are Relates: and ſo he is a Paſtor to none but his own Congregation. This is the common Tenet.

10. The members of any Church we admit to the Lords Table (if they bring Letters Teſtimoniall) and their children to Baptiſm, *The Way*, p.68. *The Keys* 17.

daggers and contradictions, *Ibid.*

10. Adminiſtration of Sacraments is a Miniſteriall act, and what authority hath a Paſtor to doe it, or they to receive it from him, to whom he is no Paſtor? M. *H.* Survey part. 2. 64, 65.

Paſtors and Teachers might pray and preach in other Churches beſide their own, but not adminiſter Seals and cenſures, *Bartlets modell.* p.63,

11. We receive the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper (ſay the ſame of Baptiſm) as a Seal of communion, not only with the Lord Jeſus in our own Churches, but in all *Churches* of the Saints, *The Keys*, p.17. See *Def.* of 9. poſ. p.133, 134.

11. Baptiſm (and ſo the other Sacrament) ſeals up the externall communion, with a particular Church, *&c.* M. *H.* Survey par. 3. pag. 27. and he diſputes againſt it, as to the Catholike Church.

12. It is an act of the Elders power and authority, to examine, whether Officers or members, before they be received of the Church, *The Keys*, pag. 21.

12. As for admiſſion, election, ordination of officers, admiſſion, and ſhutting out of members, theſe things the brethren may do without Officers, *The Way* 95, 101.

13. Ordi-

13. Ordination is then compleat, when the people have choſen him, and the Presbytery hath laid their hands on him, *The Keys*, p.37.

13. But if the Church want a Presbytery, for want of Elders, they want a warrant to repair to the Presbytery of another Church, to impoſe hands upon their elect Elders, *The Way*, pag.50.

14. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ordained to that office (of Apoſtleſhip) by the Impoſition of hands of ſome Officers or members of the Church: *The Way*, p.45.

14. In *Act.* 13.2,3. There is no Ordination to office at all: for the Apoſtles had their office before. M. *H.* Survey *part.* 2. p.83.

This was not to put a new office upon them, but to confirm their ſending to the Gentiles, *Ib.* p.60.

14. This was done in a particular Church, *The Keys*, p.29.

The Officers of one *Church* did what was done in an ordinary way, *Surv.* par.2.83. Then it follows (by M. *C.* his doctrine) that the Apoſtles who were Officers of all Churches, were ordained in a particular Church: or that Officers of one Church may be ordained in another Church, which he ſaid was unwarrantable, *The Way*, p.50.

15. What if the whole Presbytery offend? The readieſt courſe is, to bring the matter to a Synod, *The Keys*, p.43.

15. There is a readier and nearer way: The brethren may cenſure them all, *The Way*, p.45. If the Congregation be found faithfull and willing to remove an offence by due cenſure, why ſhould the offence be called up to more publike judicatures *&c. Keys* p.42.

16. It

16. It belongs to the civill Magistrate to establish pure Religion, in doctrine, worship, and government: partly by civil punishments upon the wilful opposers and disturbers of the same. *The Keys* p.50.

16. Yet the Brethren here call for or tolerate toleration of all opinions, and deny the Magistrate power to punish any pretending conscience: *Bartlets Modell.* 128.

16. See M. *Bartl. Modell* p.25, *contra.*

17. Visible Saints, though they be hypocrites inwardly, are the matter of a visible *Church*, M. *H.* Sur. par. 1. p.14,15.

17. You say, Saints in outward profession is the matter of a Congregational Church: We judge that reall Saints uttering in discourse the breathings of the holy Spirit, and experiences of conversion, witnessed in a stricter conversation, to be the matter, *D. Holmes* Ep. to *Way cleared*, p.4,

17. M. *Bartlet* speaks something this language, Can there be ability for spirituall and holy services, where the spirit is not yet given? Can there be communion between light and darkneſſe? can they edifie one another in the faith, that have not yet the work of faith wrought in them? *Mod.* p.57. See more p.103.

18. The form of the visible Church is the Covenant, either explicit or implicit; and the latter is sometimes fully sufficient: M. *H.* Sur. *par.* 1, pag. 47,48. and others.

18. You say an implicit uniting, *viz.* a walking and communicating with you is a sufficient evidencing of the Form: we say, their solemn confession of their faith, and expresse, open covenanting with the Lord, to walk with such a body of Saints, in all the waies of Christ, *&c.* to be the manifest form, D. *Holm.* Ib.

18. It is not generall profession will serve the turn, but there must be a peculiar engagement, and appropriation to this or that particular body: M. *H.* Sur. p.63. yet he said, an implicit covenant was sufficient.

19. We crave leave of the Reverend Author of the Keys, to declare, that we assent not to all expressions, or all and every assertion in it: As in these particulars.

1. About prophecying by gifted brethren.

2. That the Assembly *Act.* 15. was a formal Synod.

3. That the Apostles acted in it as ordinary Elders. *Pref. to the Keys*, p. 6.

19. We do in this Epistle certifie our assent unto the way of the Churches in *New-England*: saving that we do not yet fully close with some expressions *passim*, in the book, before some of which (ten at least, belike there are more) we minded to note a star in the Margent. This we could not but say and do (*pace tanti Authoris*) or we could not assent. *Ep. to the Way*, p. 2. f.

19. Yet they are angry, we call for a fuller Declaration of themselves, *Ep.* to the *Way*, p. 1. and *Ep.* to *Way cleared*, p. 2.

20. It is generally asserted by them, that one Church hath not power to censure another.

20. A Synod hath power to determine to withdraw communion from them, if they cannot heal them. *The Keys*, p. 25.

20. A sentence of Noncommunion denounced against whole *Churches*. *Apol. Nar* p. 18, 19.

If a sentence denounced, it is a censure.

21. We say, Instituted priviledges and ordinances doe not immediatly flow from spiritual union and relation to Christ and his members, *&c. Def.* or 9. positions. *p.* 76.

He must come at them in a right order, *i.e.* the party must be a member of a particular Congregation *Surv.* par. 2. p. 65.

21. Then it follows, that Hearing the Word preached, Singing of Psalms and Baptism, belong not to any but to such as are members of a particular Congregation.

And yet they say, ordinary hearing is no sign of a Church-member. *Sur.* par. 1. p. 18.

21. A person hath his first right to a Sacrament (and so to other Ordinances) because he hath an interest in the Covenant of the Gospel, *Survey* par. 2. 65.